

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 14-20 remain pending in the present application. Claims 7-13 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 5 and 14 have been amended. Claims 15-20 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ikeda, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,595,064). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to define that when the receiving unit receives a door unlocking request signal, both the door locking switching unit is controlled and at the same time the air conditioner is controlled. This allows for the ventilation operation to be performed just prior to a passenger entering the car since the approaching passenger would send the door un-lock signal.

Ikeda, et al. (USP 5,595,064) fails to teach the controlling of both the door locking switching unit and at the same time the air conditioner control due to the receipt of the single door un-lock signal. According to Ikeda, et al. (column 7, lines 1-8), an air-conditioning operation will be started only when a pre-air-conditioning ON switch 47a of a remote key controller 44 is operated and not when the door lock/unlock switch 46 is operated as is defined in the present invention. Thus, the air-conditioning operation is started by a different external input which is on control key 45 but it is not the door un-lock switch 46. Thus Ikeda, et al. teaches only operating the air-conditioner when it is

requested by a passenger and not with the activation of the door un-lock system of the present invention.

Thus, Applicants believe Claims 1 and 14, as amended, patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda, et al. in view of Saito, et al. (JP 355140051A). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda, et al. in view of Nishino, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,297,988). Claims 2, 4 and 6 ultimately depend from Claim 1. As stated above, Claim 1 has been amended and is now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claims 2, 4 and 6 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 15-20 are dependent claims which depend from Claim 14. Applicants believe Claims 15-20 read on the elected species. Claims 15-20 are the same as Claims 8-13, but are dependent on Claim 14.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 22, 2005

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg